

REMARKS

Claims 19-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 19 and 31 are amended. No new matter is added. Support for the amended claims can be found on at least page 6, line 30; page 8, line 15; and page 15, line 28 through page, 16, line 6. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Singh in the May 1, 2007 personal interview. The reasons presented during the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's separate record of the interview.

I. Objections to Claims

Claims 19 and 31 are objected to because of informalities. The claims have been amended responsive to the objection. Withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner stated that the listed references in the specification, JP 2000-229550 and JP 2001-233153 be submitted in a separate paper as an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS). However, as the Examiner admitted during the May 1, 2007 personal interview, the listed references were include in an IDS filed on September 14, 2004, which the Examiner has considered in the February 14, 2007 Office Action. Therefore, requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.98(b) and MPEP §609.04(a) have been complied with.

It is also submitted that the Examiner has not considered the references in an IDS filed on May 4, 2005. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the cited references.

III. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 19-21, 23-31 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2000-229550 to Toyoda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 recites the following:

a hollow-weave airbag comprising: a bag portion; and a closed portion that has two or more weave structures and adjoins the bag portion, wherein the closed portion includes, in sequence from the bag portion side, a first weave structure and a second weave structure, which adjoins a side of the first weave structure opposite the bag portion side, and the first weave structure includes one or more portions with a looser weave structure than a second weave structure.

Toyoda teaches a hollow weave airbag with a peripheral area 16 and a closed part 14. (Fig. 2). The Examiner appears to have equated Toyoda's peripheral area 16 as the closed portion of claim 19, and Toyoda's closed part 14 as the bag portion of claim 19. It is also alleged that the peripheral area 16 includes a triple weave part 26 and a quadruple weave part 28, each with a different weave structure. (Paragraph 6, February 14, 2007 Office Action). By this interpretation, Toyoda fails to teach the combination of features recited in claim 19 because the various weave structures 26 and 28 surround the closed part 14, and are in direct contact with the closed part 14. (Fig. 1). This is contrary to claim 19, which calls for the sequential arrangement, from a bag portion side, of the first weave structure and the second weave structure.

Toyoda also does not teach a closed portion that has two or more weave structures and adjoins the bag portion, wherein the interface density of the second weave structure is 4/3 or more as recited in claim 19. Although paragraph [0036] and Fig. 4 of Toyoda describes that the rough organization section 44 of seccate section 42 could be made of various basket weave structure, seccate section 42 is the same structure as the closed part 14 of Fig. 1, which has been identified by the Examiner as the same as the bag portion of current invention.

Since the basket weave does not describe the type of weave for the peripheral area, Toyoda does not read on the claimed feature.

Claim 31 has been amended to more clearly recite:

wherein at least one of the weave structures that constitute the closed portion, and that adjoins the bag portion, has a reversed bag structure, the reversed bag structure having a lower cloth and an upper cloth, where the lower cloth of the reversed bag structure is formed of warp yarns and weft yarns that constitute an upper cloth of the bag portion, and the upper cloth of the reversed bag structure is formed of warp yarns and weft yarns that constitute a lower cloth of the bag portion.

Toyoda does not teach this feature because neither the triple weave part nor the quadruple weave part 26, 28 that constitute the peripheral area 16 has a distinct reversed bag structure as defined by the claim, where the lower cloth of the reversed bag portion constitutes the upper cloth of the bag portion and the upper cloth of the reversed bag portion constitutes the lower part of the bag portion. Rather, weaves 26 and 28 of the peripheral area 16 each form a single layered section that encloses the closed part 14 without the upper/lower cloth configurations.

During the personal interview, Examiner Singh admitted that both the drawings and the description for Toyoda do not read on the above described features of either claim 19 or claim 31. However, the Examiner is requiring that the Applicants submit a certified translation of the Toyoda reference before she withdraws the rejection over Toyoda. However, upon review of the computer generated translation of Toyoda, which Applicants have already provided to the Examiner, Applicants find that the relevant sections accurately and clearly describes Toyoda's invention. Therefore, a certified translation is unnecessary as it would not add any significant material description for the reference.

For at least the above reason, the Toyoda reference cannot be reasonably considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of all the features positively recited in independent claims 19 and 31. Further, claims 20, 21, 23-30 and 33-36 are also neither

taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied prior art reference for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyoda. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed previously, Toyoda fails to include all of the limitations of independent claims 19 and 31. For at least this reason, any permissible combination of Toyoda cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combination of all the features positively recited in independent claims 19 and 31. Further, claims 22 and 32 also would not have been suggested by the prior art reference, for at least respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on allowable base claims, as well as the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims are respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 19-36 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jeoyuh Lin
Registration No. 56,032

JAO:JL/tjx

Date: May 14, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--